## REMARKS

Claims 12 and 16 have been combined better to point out that which applicant regards as his invention. Moreover, claims 4 to 11 have been revised to depend directly or indirectly from claim 12; as such, claims 4 to 11 are now directed to a decorative molding rather than to merely a decorative sheet for in-mold decorating injection molding. The claims before the Examiner thus are claims 4 to 13, each claim directed to a decorative molding formed of (1) a decorative sheet and (2) an injection-molded resin molding as recited in more detail in the claims. The revised independent claim requires the resin layer component of the decorative sheet to be an acrylic-modified polyolefin resin composed by graft-copolymerizing at least an acrylic monomer and/or an acrylic prepolymer on principal chains of a polypropylene resin.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 to 13, and 16 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Brooks et al. '654 in view of Matsumoto et al. '595 further in view of Enlow et al. '988, if applied to claims 4 to 13, is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references in combination do not properly teach or suggest the invention as claimed here. Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments

presented in the Request For Reconsideration filed August 11, 2003 are still appropriate. Applicant responds below to comments appearing in the Response to Arguments portion of the most recent Office Action.

It seems mutually agreed that Brooks et al. '654 does not teach use of any sort of an acrylic-modified polyolefin resin. The reliance by the Examiner upon the mention in Matsumoto et al. '595 of "good thermal adhesion" for the overall multicomponent composition of that reference does not in any proper way indicate that the good thermal adhesion is provided by the modified olefin polymer. There is no singling out, for example in the Abstract of the patent, of any particular component of composition being responsible for the "good adhesion" of the "flexible thermoplastic resinous composition." The Examiners to date in this prosecution have cited no portion of Matsumoto et al. '595 to state, indicate, or suggest what particular role is played by the modified olefin polymer. Applicant submits with respect that the references in combination do not "suggest" to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the modified olefin polymer outside the context of entire composition of Matsumoto et al. '595 would provide the

Serial No. 09/778,096

characteristics of the present invention. Conclusions have been reached unsupported by the record.

The Examiner also indicates that no showing demonstration has been made that the decorative sheet material of Brooks et al. '654 does not exhibit the same features or advantages as claimed herein. The Examiner is asked initially to bear in mind that the claims now are directed to the decorative molding combination rather than to the decorative sheet subcombination. The Examiner's attention is directed to the showing in Table 2 at page 24 of the specification. chlorinated polypropylene in the comparative examples representative of polyolefin resins that are not The results appearing in that table establish the patentability of the claims here. See the discussion of the results in that table at page 24, line 6 to page 26, line 13. The rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 to 13 are in immediate condition for allowance and a USPTO paper is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Serial No. 09/778,096

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L,P

Charles A. Wendel

Registration No. 24,453

CAW/ch

Attorney Docket No.: DAIN:574

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

1421 Prince Street

Suite 210

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220